The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AUG 14 1915

Vol. 7
No. 4

AUGUST
1915

A WAR-LIKE SUFFRAGIST PEACE CONFERENCE

WHERE SUFFRAGE LEADERS STAND ON FEMINISM

THE DOG AND THE SHADOW

WHY JUDGES OPPOSE SUFFRAGE

"IGNORANCE OF FUNDAMENTALS"

MILITANT WORDS AND DEEDS

SUFFRAGE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION

ELIHU ROOT'S POSITION

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.

Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.

Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James M. Codman, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. Clarence Morgan, Burlington, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven; Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield; Mrs. H. H. Mason, Farmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William I. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

Organization Committee, Wilmington.

Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Office: 526 North Charles Street, Baltimore.

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Rosalie Straus, Mrs. P. Lea Thom, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse.
Recording Secretary, Mrs Nathan A. Middleton.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. F. A. Merrill, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. E. G. Abbott.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Room 615.

President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Ellen Tower.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis
Executive Committee, Minneapolis, Mrs. J. S. Bell, Mrs. G. H. Christian, Mrs. H. C. Clarke, Mrs. H. Harcourt Horn, Mrs. L. K. Hull, Mrs. C. J. Martin, Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, Mrs. J. R. Marfield, Mrs. O. C. Wyman, Mrs. John Washburn, Mrs. C. C. Webber; St. Paul, Mrs. D. F. De Wolf, Miss Mary Davis, Miss Caroline Fairchild, Mrs. Emerson Hadley, Mrs. A. H. Lindeke, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. C. L. Spencer, Mrs. F. F. Wright.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Croloot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 1909 Capitol Avenue, Omaha.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.

Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Mrs. H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, Mrs. William S. Stryker, Mrs. Sherman B. Joost, Mrs. Henry M. Darcy, Mrs. Theodore C. Woodbury.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.
Finance Chairman, Mrs. John Constable Moore.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.

President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. C. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Moyine, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Field Secretaries, Miss Lucy Price, Cleveland; Miss Clara Markeson, Columbus; Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.
Campaign Headquarters: 1101 Finance Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall, Mrs. Samuel D. Riddle.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edmund C. Mower, Mrs. Frank Parker.
Secretary, Mrs. Arthur Myrick.
Treasurer, Mrs. Walter Isham.
Chairman of Executive Board, Mrs. Humphrey.
Chairman Publicity Committee, Miss Lindsey.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.

President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Otho G. Kean, Mrs. E. Randolph Williams, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. E. V. Valentine, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Mrs. Henry Harwood, Mrs. Hunter McGuire.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William L. Gray.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Room 320, Oxford Bldg., 726 14th Street.

President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George G. Worthington.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Chairman; Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.; Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. George B. Puller, Mrs. Jessie Lincoln Beckwith, Mrs. Douglas Putnam Birnie, Miss Murray Ledyard, Miss Anne Squire, Miss Josephine Patten.
In Charge of Headquarters, Mrs. J. Alex Mahon.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

A WAR-LIKE SUFFRAGIST PEACE CONFERENCE

A SUFFRAGE conference was held in San Francisco early in July. The advance announcements called it "Ten Days of Suffrage," but the newspapers were told that it was "The International Conference of Women Workers for the Promotion and Promulgation of Peace."

Mrs. Philip Snowden, a British Suffragette, delivered an address from which the following is quoted:

"There are many war-mad women in England just as there are there war-mad men, because they believe that war is inevitable. War can be stopped by education and the development of the right spirit; by the development of co-operation instead of competition, by brotherly love instead of race antagonism."

There is nothing astonishing about this doctrine, except the fact that it was uttered by a Suffragist. It is sound anti-suffrage doctrine. Education rather than the machinery of the ballot as the proper device for bringing about needed reforms is the heart of the anti-suffrage method. But such development cannot be accomplished over night. The French illustrate this when they say: "It is not at the moment of high tide that one builds one's dikes." Just what this suffrage conference accomplished and how its proceedings were conducted is told in the following report, taken from the Hearst (suffrage) newspaper, the San Francisco *Examiner* of July 8th.

(From the *Examiner*)

PEACE triumphed over war yesterday at the final session of the Women's Peace Conference in the First Congregational Church. Peace triumphed by force of arms and the physical prowess of Mrs. May Wright Sewall, chairman of the conference.

Mrs. Sewall represented embattled peace. Rabbi Jacob Nieto of the Congregation Sherith Israel was innocuous War.

After many days of bitterness and balked oratory, the conference had reached the resolution passing stage. Rabbi Nieto, celebrated proponent of Peace and Philanthropy, had been invited to sit among the speakers in the choir loft of Dr. Aked's church. He accepted and expected to make a speech.

San Franciscans who saw him there naturally joined in that expectation, hoping for one of those felicitous discourses, for which he is noted, that would heal the wounds of the other days.

The session passed through another acrid period yesterday morning for about an hour with no opportunity for the rabbi to talk. Then Mrs. Sewall, who presided, called upon Mrs. William I. Thomas, executive secretary, to read resolutions, the result of the conference's three-day struggle. They were 11 and they were radical.

Mrs. Sewall, addressing the audience out front—there were many women and four men—called for remarks.

Rabbi Nieto, emboldened by this invitation, unfolded his great length and arose.

"These resolutions," he said, "are too many and too arrogant. They—"

He got no further. Mrs. Sewall advanced toward him, waving the gavel threateningly. She shook the wooden mallet and cried:

"This is a woman's conference. We'll hear from no man."

Rabbi Nieto's lips moved and he stood his ground. Mrs. Sewall, who is as large as she is determined, placed her hands on his shoulders and forced him to his seat.

"This is a woman's conference," she repeated. "We'll put him in the front seat where he can be seen and not heard."

Thereupon she led the distinguished rabbi to the front row, and she sat him there in a place of prominence.

AND THE RABBI SAT THERE FOR TWO HOURS.

Meanwhile the resolutions were passed, or most of them. Mrs. Sewall, happy in her conquest of man, smiled ever and anon upon the rabbi. Between raps of the gavel she talked to him in good natured asides. He said never a word. He was in a conspicuous position, and he expected to make that speech. After the snub it was imperative that he be generous and unusually eloquent. His black eyes flashed, but otherwise he manifested no emotion.

AFTER TWO HOURS Mrs. Sewall permitted the conference to adjourn.

Rabbi Nieto did not make a speech. Women and peace conquered.

The rabbi was not alone in his ignominy. Those four other men who were mere spectators in the audience were squelched also. First the resolutions were read in toto. Rabbi Nieto objected and subsided. Then they were read separately. There was silence until No. 4 was reached. It says: "We protest against military drill in all schools and academic institutions." Then the four arose to protest.

Mrs. Sewall interrupted each male protest with:

"Men cannot have any part in this conference of Women Workers."

And the men sat down.

There was more war earlier in the day. Dr. Leonie Fordham of Switzerland made a speech, punctuated with scathing humor. She carried the audience with her, but Mrs. Sewall objected to the resulting demonstration, which led Dr. Fordham to remark:

"I am learning a great many things in America. When Mrs. Sewall wishes a speaker to stop talking she comes and puts her arm around the waist and frowns. But when Mrs. Sewall talks no one can stop her."

Laughter and applause greeted this sally, but the Swiss woman's humor did not penetrate the seriousness of Mrs. Sewall. Instead, she walked to the speaker's platform, took the gavel in hand and said with great and meaning emphasis:

"I really want the speech stopped."

And the speech stopped.

That made three passes at arms at one peace conference. It even beat the record of Tuesday when Mme. Katherine Tingley, head of the Universal Brotherhood, took issue with the autocrat and got away with it.

For the rest of yesterday's session there was much seriousness. Mrs. Chen Chi, wife of the Chinese Commissioner in Chief to the Exposition, read a paper. Somebody in the audience asked that she speak louder, and was reprimanded by Mrs. Sewall. One paragraph in Mrs. Chen's paper was notable:

"The place where we can best serve peace is in the home. Children must be taught a new standard of honor. It has been conceded the world over that women are more gentle than men. Shall we waste this gift of gentleness or shall we consecrate it to hasten a cause that must succeed?"

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VII August, 1915 No. 4

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

THE Anti-Suffragists are "The Home, Heaven and Mother" Party. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, says so. If you like home, heaven and mother, and are going our way, join us!—*From the May* PROTEST.

The president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association has recently denied the above. Nevertheless the official report of the hearing before the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the United States Senate on Saturday, April 26, 1913, shows that she said, among other things:

"We do not fear that little band of professional Anti women going around the country advocating Home, Heaven and Mother."—*From The Congressional Record.*

At the time this speech was made the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage might by a stretch of the imagination be considered "a little band."

At the present writing both the Suffragists and politicians acknowledge that we are "a party."

The charge that we are "professional" seems amusing in view of the list of the active members of our National Board and our State Associations as printed on the second page of the WOMAN'S PROTEST.

SINCE the writing of the Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson in 1876, two notable attempts have been made to parody it. The first was executed at the earliest "woman's rights" convention held at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848.

The historic document our country honors has never pleased the Suffragists. The parody of it they wrote in 1848 was an atrocity. Years ago, Susan B. Anthony attempted to read this parody in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, but was denied the opportunity. It was afterwards read in adjoining square. But now, the Suffragists have become so tired of their old "declaration of sentiments" that they have brought out another.

Their official organ now blazes "A Modern Declaration of Independence," quoting the document of Jefferson almost verbatim at first, with the exception of saying "and women" which was probably suggested by a cartoon in "Life" several weeks ago. But finally it rings in severe indictments against the United States Government, the first two of which are these:

"It has raised armies and navies without our consent."

"It has declared war without our sanction."

The ridiculous nature of this far-fetched complaint at this time makes one question the judgment of the Suffragists.

The extent to which they will go in condemning the army and navy at this critical time in our history is a good indication of their fitness to have a voice in the grave problems of government.

But to prove that patriotism, love of country, manliness, courage and honor are dead in the male sex, here comes their arch pacificist, Miss Jane Addams, trying to tell us that practically all the men fighting in Europe are doped and drunk.

Richard Harding Davis, the world's greatest war correspondent, calls her charge an insult, "flung by a complacement and self-satisfied woman at men who gave their lives for men."

Mr. Davis is right in believing that with him "are those men and women who respect courage and honor." He says of Miss Addams's charge:

"Miss Addams desires peace. So does everyone else. But she will not attain it by misrepresentation. I have seen more of this war and other wars than Miss Addams, and where Miss Addams can furnish one argument in favor of peace I can furnish a hundred.

"In my opinion, since the war began, no statement has been so unworthy, so untrue and so ridiculous.

When a war correspondent of Mr. Davis's standing feels so strongly on this subject that he must accuse the foremost advocate of woman suffrage and "peace-at-any-price" in this country of misrepresentation, it is time for the general public to examine the mental processes of some of these suffrage agitators.

The "antis" have never held women inferior to men. We have always insisted that one of the proofs of woman's equality of intelligence is the fact that the majority of normal women have enough common sense not to be misled by the misrepresentations and fallacious propaganda of the suffrage cause. It is no reflection of women to point out the crazy things that Suffragists are doing. There are male agitators making fools of themselves as often as the women are—but they do not get the free advertising. Mr. George Creel who told the Suffragists that "all Antis ought to be burned alive" was on a par with any Suffragist in absolute folly.

The overwhelming majority of the women of this whole country do not desire the franchise. They do not want to spend their time trying to check and cancel and outvote the Suffragists. They desire to be represented by capable, normal men—not by hysterical, blind, misled women who would misrepresent them. The general opposition to woman suffrage on the part of the women of this whole country is proved no better than by the present suffrage campaign of street canvassing in San Francisco—where women have voted almost four years—to try to get up an alleged "woman voter's" sentiment; and the circulation throughout Colorado and other western suffrage states where women have voted for one or two generations of an editorial from a yellow journal in favor of "votes-for-women." With a mint of money behind their movement, the Suffragists have deliberately undertaken the task of manufacturing public sentiment in this country to favor their agitation. Nothing is better indicative of the natural unpopularity of their movement than this present trial to get suffrage "indorsed" by women who have had the franchise for years. With more money at their command than was ever available to a political party in a National election, the votes-for-women agitators hope to "put over" their bill this fall in the campaign states by any argument or "stunt" they can conceive.

They care not how crazy it is, if it will get "publicity"—free advertising—for the "cause."

The United States "has raised armies and navies without their consent."

Thank God that it has. And every woman in this Nation whose father or husband fought for the preservation of this Union, every mother whose son is wearing or is willing to wear the uniform of Uncle Sam's soldiers and sailors should this Government ever find it necessary to defend itself, will resent, with Mr. Richard Harding Davis the "far-flung insult" to manhood that the Suffragists have deliberately put out, not only to the brave men who lay down their lives in defense of their country, but to our great original Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, one of the clearest thinking Anti-Suffragists of all time. —Mrs. JOHN B. HERON.

WHERE SUFFRAGE LEADERS STAND ON "FEMINISM"

Arranged by Miss Eliza D. Armstrong, Registrar, Pittsburgh Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

WHAT is Feminism? Woman suffrage? Socialism? Or what? Naturally, the best answers will be furnished by the Feminists, and therefore, as briefly as possible, we will review the authorities on this subject, authorities that no Feminist, whether a mild believer in "votes for women" or a leader in the Social Revolution can question.

The New International Encyclopædia says: "Feminism may be called the discovery of woman as man." "Feminism is the term used to describe the body of ideas and motives which lie at the root of the modern woman movement."

"The agitation for political equality is the most conspicuous side of the feminist movement in the United States at present, but other lines of development should not be ignored."

The Encyclopædia says that "Feminism" has been in use since 1890. Who were the first Feminists?

The Encyclopædia quotes Fourier and Saint-Simon, originators of Socialism, as the first to teach feministic ideals. It says:

"Fourier bitterly attacked the ideals of bourgeois marriage and proposed freer sexual relations. Already in the communist manifesto of 1847, Marx and Engels had alluded to the woman wage-worker. August Bebel gave this idea its greatest development in his work on Woman and Socialism, which has become the gospel of feminist socialists. He analyzed the basis of the economic interpretation of history and concluded that bourgeois marriage had developed from bourgeois property relations, that it did not even satisfy the sexual instinct * * * that it was not suited to modern economic relation. Marriage should be a private contract and the rearing of children should become a social responsibility.

"More radical proposals involve salaries for wives, widows' pensions, the state endowment of motherhood and the state responsibility for the rearing of children, and the emancipation from domestic work of the highly trained woman."

Here are some suffrage definitions of Feminism:

"A world-wide revolt against all artificial barriers which laws and customs interpose between women and human freedom."

It will be noticed that the Socialist Feminists were strongly against the family and marriage. What did the first Suffragists think of it?

Hear Elizabeth Cady Stanton, before what Horace Greeley called the "Easy Divorce" convention of woman Suffragists in 1860:

"Marriage, as it now exists, must seem to all of you a mere human institution. * * * You all know our marriages, in many cases, are a mere outward tie, impelled by custom, policy, interest, necessity; founded not even on friendship, to say nothing of love. So long as you insist on marriage as a divine institution, as an indissoluble tie, so long as you maintain your present laws against divorce you make separation, even, so odious that the most noble men and women choose a life of concealed misery rather than a partial disgraceful release. Secondly, those who in their impetuosity and despair do, in spite of public sentiment, separate, find themselves in their new position beset with many temptations to lead a false, unreal life. This isolation bears especially hard on woman. Now, if a noble, generous girl of 18 marries and is unfortunate because the cruelty of her husband compels separation, in her dreary isolation would you drive her to a nunnery; and shall she be a nun indeed? Her solitude is nothing else.

"The right of woman to put away a husband, be he ever so impure, is never hinted at in sacred history. Even Jesus Himself failed to recognize the sacred rights of the Holy Mother of the race. We cannot take our gauge of womanhood from the past but from the solemn convictions of our own souls in the higher development of the race. No parchments however venerable with the mould of ages, no human institutions can bound the wants of the royal sons and daughters of the great I AM—rightful heirs of the joys of time and joint heirs of the glories of eternity. If in marriage either party claims the right to stand supreme, to the woman, the mother of the race, belongs the sceptre and the crown."

At the same convention, at which she presided, Susan B. Anthony, the mother of the suffrage movement in America, said:

"As to the point of view that this question (divorce) does not belong to this platform—from that I totally dissent. Marriage has ever been a one-sided matter resting most unequally upon the sexes. By it, man gains all, and woman loses all, tyrant law and lust reign supreme with him—meek submission and ready obedience alone befit her. Woman has never been consulted, her wish has never been taken into consideration as regards the terms of the marriage compact. By law, public sentiment and religion, from the time of Moses down to the present day, woman has never been thought of other than as a piece of property to be disposed of at the pleasure of man. At this very hour, by our statute books, by our so-called Christian civilization, she has no voice whatever in saying what should be the basis of the relation. The discussion is perfectly in order since nearly all the wrongs of which we complain grow out of the inequality, the injustice of the marriage laws."

In a letter to the N. Y. *Tribune*, Elizabeth Cady Stanton wrote in 1860: "Out of marriage woman asks nothing at this time but the elective franchise. It is only in marriage that she must demand her rights to person, children, property, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Elizabeth Cady Stanton further stated in this communication:

"There has never been a woman's convention held in which the injustice suffered by wives and mothers has not been a topic for discussion, and legitimately so. And if the only way of escape from the infamous laws by which all power is placed in the hands of man is through divorce, then that is the hospitable door to open for those who wish to escape."

Do the present leaders of the suffrage movement share the ideas of the pioneers regarding marriage as a merely "human institution," a private contract instead of a Christian ceremony? Hear Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in an authorized special interview in a suffrage newspaper:

"I have this much to say, and that is that the marriage ceremony should be cut out. It is useless and has served its day. The marriage service is a poll-parrot affair. No woman obeys her husband. It is positively wicked to use this word (obey) in the marriage contract. Why women think that they should give up their life work simply because they have been married is a puzzle to me. If I were a czar I would unmarry half the people I know."

As proof that she considered marriage purely as a contract

between a man and a woman, Dr. Shaw said: "I have always believed in making the ceremony fit the occasion. In other words, I have a different service for each marriage. The principals consult me beforehand and we prepare the vows. It is for this reason that the pledge is always different, according to the views and convictions of the couples. * * * When I spoke to one young man about preparing the vows, he asked: 'Why should I pledge if I want her for my wife?' He was right. The very fact that he was taking her for his wedded wife meant everything the word signified. It meant more than to cherish, love and honor. Why should he single out a few things to promise * * *? Long ceremonies are boresome. Therefore, I try to make mine as short as possible.

"I have been criticized for cutting out 'until death do us part.' It has been said that I advocated trial marriage. But how do I or any other minister know whether the couple will be flying to the divorce court in a year or two. We cannot look into the future. Why then should we try to force ourselves to believe that they will live happy ever after? * * * To them the saying of 'till death do us part' is only a mockery."

That a couple could prepare "trial marriage vows" and have Dr. Shaw perform the pagan rite of uniting them according to their own "views" seems obvious.

Dr. Shaw has also said: "The extreme feminists wish to do away with our entire marriage system, to eliminate the modern idea of the home, *et cetera.*"

Max Eastman, an extreme feminist, now advocating the teaching of "Revolutionary Birth Control"—which is the new name for legalized instruction in race suicide—said a year ago of the woman editor of the *Woman Rebel,* whose magazine was suppressed by the postal authorities for obscenity:

In Margaret Sanger's new magazine, the *Woman Rebel,* with its motto 'No Gods, No Masters,' I look for a strong and affirmative stand on the final goal of feminism." Max Eastman was the first man to organize a Men's League for Woman Suffrage in this country, he has spoken in the homes of the most conservative Suffragists of Pennsylvania, and for over a year his pamphlets ridiculing the "home and mother sentiment" headed the list of "What to Read on Woman Suffrage" that the National American Woman Suffrage Association advertised in socialistic magazines. This is Feminism. More might be quoted—that is unfit for a decent newspaper to print, but these are enough to show what Feminism stands for.

Furthermore, let it be remembered that the "Easy Divorce" suffrage convention held in 1860 was the first organized movement for that end in this country. The Civil War broke up the agitation, which was renewed again in 1867—the year when the United States Census Bureau first found it necessary to compile records of divorces granted. Since that time, divorces have increased terribly, but most of all where women have the vote. Denver, which leads the whole country in divorce in proportion to population, where women have voted for twenty-three years, recently broke its own record with fifty-four applications for divorce in a single afternoon. What is Feminism? Consider the sentiments of the Feminists themselves, the pagan, individualistic ideas they have of marriage, and then look up the divorce records. The answer is plain.

The Feminists say that anyhow suffrage will not break up homes, in spite of these preachments. That is just exactly what the first pleaders for easy divorce said in 1860. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a suffrage leader of that time, said: "In states where the laws have been very liberal for many years family life is as beautiful and permanent as in South Carolina and New York, where the tie can be dissolved for one reason only."

Perhaps that is the reason Nevada, immediately after the passage of the suffrage amendment last November, reduced the time for obtaining a divorce from one year to six months.

(NOTE.—In regard to the accuracy of the quotations in this article, we challenge any Suffragist, Socialist or Feminist to deny any of them. We possess the original documents issued by the Suffragists and Feminists containing these quotations.—Editor, PROTEST.)

THE FABLE OF THE DOG AND THE SHADOW

By THERESA W. RICHARDSON

AESOP, years ago gave the world the following pungent and truthful fable:

"THE DOG AND THE SHADOW.

"A dog had stolen a piece of meat out of a butcher's shop and was crossing a river on his way home, when he saw his own shadow reflected in the stream below. Thinking it was another dog with another piece of meat, he resolved to make himself master of that also; but in snapping at the supposed treasure, he dropped the bit he was carrying and so lost all. Grasp at the shadow and lose the substance—the common fate of those who hazard a real blessing for some visionary good."

Ours is a vast opportunity to serve our country. We are unshackled by party restraints, we are unfettered by political affiliations. American women stand for the highest ideals in the world. Let us continue to do so—to stand for humanitarian, non-partisan reform—and yet there are some, who, like the dog on the bridge seeing the piece of meat magnified in the water, are deceived into thinking that the vote is bigger than public opinion, that the tool is greater than the worker, and that legislation is a substitute for character

What this country needs above all else to-day is respect for the law. We need not so much new legislation, as the enforcement of existing laws. It is comparatively easy to get legislation—we have proved that—but it is hard to enforce what we have gained. There are laws limiting the hours of work for women, there are child labor laws, there are laws guarding their morality, but you know, as I know, that these are not enforced. Laws are not obeyed unless public opinion is behind them. And who makes public opinion a moving, vital force? Yes, who makes public opinion itself? You, and I, and all women. In matters of moral importance we play the largest part, and yearly our influence grows, because each year we realize more its impelling value, and we use it with greater efficiency. This public opinion, which we regulate, is no abstract theory, it is a strong, effective weapon. There have been child labor laws on the statute books of Minnesota for over twenty years, but when did they begin to be effective? When they were passed? No, not then, but when public opinion awoke to their necessity. The evils which the women say they would combat with the vote are largely not the evils which the law permits—rather are they

the evils which the law forbids and which public opinion permits—and the voting power of no man, woman or child can change this.

Efficiency is the most wonderful thing in the world, and the discovery of the theory of specialization makes this the most efficient of ages. The man no longer mends the shoes for the entire family, because he is of more use to himself and to the community in the line in which he specializes. Yet some women would retard our national development by generalizing work, by duplicating effort. They would do not only the distinct work which they are now accomplishing, but they would also do what the men are doing, they would vote. As true as is the axiom, an object cannot be in two places at the same time, is the modern theory of efficiency—a person cannot do two things and do them both in the best possible way.

Give me the ballot, and the man for whom I vote becomes one I cannot criticize without criticism of my own discernment. I become a Republican, a Democrat, a Progressive—whatever it may be, I become a creature of party. Leave me without the ballot. Man, the voter, the creature of party, the prejudiced, looks to me for an unbiased statement of facts based on my impartial investigation of results. Shall we narrow ourselves with the fetters which man must carry, or shall we rather remain on that broader and higher plane where non-partisanship keeps our criticism free from suspicion? Here we can criticize without disloyalty to candidate or party, without bartering or political compromise. But give us the vote and we have lost all this. Moreover, we have lost it forever. Write into the Constitution suffrage legislation and we have lost something we can never regain. One woman, desiring the vote for personal reasons, can refuse to be disenfranchised, and no law can relieve us. This is no experiment, it is absolute, final—once a voter, always a voter.

That woman has broadened cannot to-day be questioned. She has done this without the ballot. She will continue to do so without the ballot. Perhaps she will do so despite the ballot, but this we do not know. Certainly man, with the franchise, has not broadened as has woman without it. She has not only retained all her merits of the past, she has achieved a new respect—a respect for her unbiased opinion on social and economic conditions. While the average man's interest centres largely in candidates and political controversy, she has been open to every broadening influence, and each year her interests widen to include the larger problems of the social and economic world.

We moderns admire individuality, and the individuality of the modern woman is in no slight degree due to the fact that she has been without the vote and so is non-partisan. She is non-political. She has no bonds. She takes no political creed from party politicians. What she likes she takes, the rest she discards. She can be what she will.

No one political party can claim to be wholly representative of this great country of ours. If it could be there would be but one party and we should approximate a Utopia. So, necessarily, no member of any one party can claim to represent all that is best in America. Always there must be parties, and always men must be bound more or less to one party or another, for only so is the suffrage properly guarded and governed. Hence it follows that the influence of the individual man rises or falls with his party. But woman is blessed in this, she has no party. She can always make her influence felt, through the home, the club, the church, the social life—in as many ways as there are women. She may take the ideas of one party in one particular and of others in other matters. It lies within her power to make herself a representative of the best that is in America. This is individuality, this is character, and she is, or should be, the ideal American, for this is freedom.

The Suffragists tell us what the vote will give us. Ask them what it will take from us? Is it a gain to have to work through a party machine? Is it an advantage to have to gain your object by political compromise and strategic juggling? Look at the results attained by women in the last fifty years. Is it not a wise influence which has forced the enactment of laws intended to protect women and children? Is not the whole country profiting by the fact that we can go straight to the Governor, to the Mayor, to whom we will, and know that he will give us respectful attention whatever the party in control, for we alone have no political ties. We are the one mighty body working solely for the public good, regardless of party bonds. And in the face of all this, and all we are now accomplishing, are we to be robbed, beyond possibility or recovery, of all that sets us above boss and above party?

Let us keep our idealism. Let us continue to stand, as we do to-day, for a broader moral and social life. Untouched, undivided by the war of politics, let us use the mightiest and surest weapon of the ages—public opinion. We do not want the vote. It would but add to our duties, narrow our horizon, and prejudice our judgments. But we do want that same fair and impartial influence which we are exercising to-day to go on broadening indefinitely for the public good, for our own development and for our country.

SOUND REASONS WHY JUDGES OPPOSE SUFFRAGE

AN anti-suffrage appeal has just been presented to the Georgia General Assembly by three prominent judges and a lawyer of whom a certain judge says: "I regard him as the foremost lawyer at the Atlanta Bar."

This appeal urges the legislature to oppose the submission of woman suffrage to the people, not only because the majority of the Georgia women do not want to vote, but because woman suffrage would be harmful to the state.

This statement, dated July 1, reads:

"The undersigned citizens of Georgia urge your careful and intelligent consideration of a Bill that will be urged before you asking that the Constitution of the State be so changed as to confer upon the women of the State the elective franchise. Personal and insistent appeals will be made to you by ladies to support this measure. The natural disposition on the part of men to grant the request of the other sex may cause you, if you are not careful, to lose sight of the importance of the movement involved. The doubling of our electorate will have a prodigious effect for good or for evil upon the highest and best interests of your State, and, when a matter of this magnitude is considered, the disposition to please, complaisance and indifference ought to be set aside. True friendship for the good women of the State forbids that a request from any of their number, no matter how earnestly urged, be granted, unless you really believe that the great change in our law which is involved will promote their best interests and those of your State.

"The Constitution itself has carefully guarded its amendment, and contemplates that no change be made in our fundamental law, except after careful consideration of its merits, and then only in the manner pointed out by the instrument. One of the

prerequisites is that the proposed amendment shall be first 'agreed to by two-thirds of the members elected to each of the two Houses.' When this agreement has been had, then, after full notice to the people, it must be submitted for their ratification and approved by them. The argument will probably be urged upon you that in voting for this proposed amendment you do not pass finally upon its merits, and that you ought to give the people of the State an opportunity to consider it. But your responsibility cannot be evaded by heeding an argument of this kind. You cannot disregard one of the safeguards thrown around an amendment to the Constitution. You are as completely bound to consider and pass upon this question on its merits as you would be if your decision were final.

"The Constitution itself, in providing for its amendment, looks particularly to the members of the Legislature, and expects them to see to it that no change is made in our fundamental law except after careful consideration of its merits and the endorsement of its wisdom by these members. While it is to be submitted finally to popular vote, yet a bare majority of those voting at the general election can ratify. The members of your body are relied on to see to it that no amendment is submitted to the people without the careful consideration and endorsement of two-thirds of each House. As a practical fact, where the people are not aroused, usually only those who favor an amendment vote for it, and the body of the voters pay no attention to it. The votes on many Constitutional amendments will prove this. Hence the necessity for the careful and conscientious discharge of your duty in this important matter.

"In determining this grave question, you will not overlook the terms of your oath of office, set forth in section 6419 of the Code of Georgia, wherein you solemnly promise that (quoting from the oath) 'on all questions and measures which may come before me, I will so conduct myself as will, in my judgment, be most conducive to the interest and prosperity of this State.' This establishes your responsibility as a very personal one, and gives to the State the benefit of your individual judgment as to what is wisest and best, a judgment that is of particular value to the State when you are called upon to amend in a vital respect its fundamental law.

"The undersigned take the liberty of earnestly submitting for your consideration our conviction that the proposed change in our law will not conduce to the interests and prosperity of our State. The status of women in this State and the reason for a denial to them of the elective franchise are thus correctly expressed in a decision of the Supreme Court of the State, to be found on page 98 of the 116th volume: 'Females of all ages are and have always been in this State relieved of the burdensome duties of citizenship, such as military, jury, police, patrol, and road duty. Being excused from the performance of the burdensome duties of citizenship they have never had conferred upon them some of the privileges of citizenship, which, although their exercise may carry with it little or no burden, at the same time are privileges fraught with responsibility. Both society and the law, however, in many respects accord to females greater rights and greater protection than to males. Females being by nature burdened with duties and responsibilities which men cannot perform, have cast upon them, by the demands of society, duties and responsibilities which, even if capable of being performed at all by males, cannot be so well performed. Those who formed and framed governments in the past, in consideration of these facts, have generally done that which has been done in this State—withdrawn from the female citizen all privileges of citizenship relating to the affairs of government, and relieved her from all of the burdensome duties which the male citizen is required to perform in return for the protection which the government gives to him. The female citizen has been and will always be at least equally protected with males by the law, notwithstanding the disabilities imposed upon her by nature which prevent her from performing many of the more important duties of citizenship. The law always has protected and always will protect this class of citizens, and should always relieve them from all duties relating to governmental affairs, that they may not be disturbed in the performance of those duties imposed upon them by nature and society, and which are higher and more important to the welfare of society than the exercise of any civil function.'

"We are reliably informed that a large number of Georgia women have signed protests against the placing of the burden and responsibility of the elective franchise upon their sex. We believe that they represent a large majority of the white women of your State. We beg to commend to your earnest consideration the following excerpts which we take from their protest:

"'We wish to draw your attention to the fact that the majority of Georgia women are firmly opposed to any such amendment, believing that the disadvantage of political life for women far out-weighs any advantage that has ever been gained by such increase of the electorate.

"'This Association is convinced that the importance of non-political women to the state is greater than ever before, and that they cannot do your work and their own. They are needed, not only for the highest of all vocations—wife and mother—but for their disinterested work in charitable, civic educational and other activities. The people are beginning to see plainly that it can never be done if all women are "put into politics."

"'It is far easier to make good laws than to make good citizens, which we are now striving to do through organizations and by individual effort. Do your duty—but do not confine our interests within party lines, nor waste our energies in political warfare.'

"In this communication we cannot even summarize the arguments against the movement. They conduce, we believe, to the conclusion that its success will be inimical to the interests of the state and of both sexes. The womanly qualities are quite as important, if not more so, to the elevation and progress of society as are the manly virtues. The whole development of civilization has been on the lines of differentiation, and of each sex pursuing that line of life best calculated to develop the peculiar qualities of each, and, therefore, the best qualities of the individual and the race. We deprecate any movement which ignores or imperils sex differences and the distinctly womanly qualities.

"You will bear in mind that it is proposed to give the elective franchise, not to the conscientious and intelligent women only, but to all women, and that, under the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and its recent construction and application by the Supreme Court of the United States, this franchise cannot be confined to the women of the white race. In Georgia the movement is particularly perilous.

"Respectfully yours,

"J. C. C. Black, (Augusta, Ga.)
"Andrew J. Cobb, (Athens, Ga.)
"Samuel B. Adams, (Savannah, Ga.)
"Alexander C. King, (Atlanta, Ga.)"

(From *The Outlook*)

THE home is not primarily a place for work but for life; work lies below and beyond it, but the companionship which transforms a house into a home is a sharing of the rewards of work: freedom, repose, refreshment, vision. There are houses full of conveniences and luxuries in which no one is at home; the men and women who live in them are homeless. To such men and women, as to the men and women to whom marriage is a mere social contract and the family a mere social arrangement, there is no going home, no refuge for the spirit, no place of understanding and vision. There are no more pathetic figures in the world of to-day than these homeless men and women; restless, discontented and unhappy, and utterly blind to the tragedy of a life in which there is no going home.

"IGNORANCE OF FUNDAMENTAL FACTS"

(A Letter from Richard Harding Davis)

TO the Editor of the New York *Times:*

"On Friday night at Carnegie Hall Miss Jane Addams stated that in the present war, in order to get soldiers to charge with the bayonet, all nations are forced first to make them drunk. I quote from the *Times* report:

"'In Germany they have a regular formula for it [she said]. In England they use rum, and the French resort to absinthe. In other words, therefore, in the terrible bayonet charges they speak of with dread, the men must be doped before they start.'

"In this war the French or English soldier who has been killed in bayonet charge gave his life to protect his home and country. For his supreme exit he had prepared himself by months of discipline. Through the winter in the trenches he had endured shells, disease, snow and ice. For months he had been separated from his wife, children, friends—all those he most loved. When the order to charge came it was for them he gave his life, that against those who destroyed Belgium they might preserve their home, might live to enjoy peace.

"Miss Addams denies him the credit of his sacrifice. She strips him of honor and courage. She tells his children, 'Your father did not die for France, or for England, or for you; he died because he was drunk.'

"In my opinion, since the war began, no statement has been so unworthy or so untrue and ridiculous. The contempt it shows for the memory of the dead is appalling; the credulity and ignorance it displays are inconcievable.

"Miss Addams does not know that even from France they have banished absinthe. If she doubts that in this France has succeeded let her ask for it. I asked for it, and each *maitre d'hôtel* treated me as though I had proposed we should assassinate General Joffre.

"If Miss Addams does know that the French Government has banished absinthe, then she is accusing it of openly receiving the congratulations of the world for destroying the drug while secretly using it to make fiends of the army. If what Miss Addams states is true, then the French Government is rotten. French officers deserve only court-martial, and French soldiers are cowards.

"If we are to believe her, the Canadians at Ypres, the Australians in the Dardanelles, the English and the French on the Aisne made no supreme sacrifice, but were killed in a drunken brawl.

"Miss Addams desires peace. So does every one else. But she will not attain peace by misrepresentation. I have seen more of this war and other wars than Miss Addams, and I know all war to be wicked, wasteful and unintelligent, and where Miss Addams can furnish one argument in favor of peace I will furnish a hundred. But against this insult, flung by a complacent and self-satisfied woman at men who gave their lives for men, I protest. And I believe that with me are all those women and men who respect courage and honor.

"RICHARD HARDING DAVIS."

Miss Addams's much-quoted remark regarding the bayonet charges is credited by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler as being on a par with other suffragist statements which show ignorance of the fundamental facts of human nature.

Mr. Wheeler's letter to the New York *Times* is pertinent:

"To the Editor:

"In your issue of July 10th you publish a report of Miss Jane Addams's speech at Carnegie Hall. For her, as a philanthropist and social worker, I have had great respect. Our settlements in New York, including the East Side House, of which I was myself a founder, have learned much from Hull House. But as a politician she seems to me a pitiful failure. You report her as saying:

"'In order to make bayonet charges all nations make their soldiers practically drunk, before it is possible. * * * In other words, before the terrible bayonet charges they speak of with dread, the men must be doped before they will start.'

"Now, I have a son in the French Army and have been in the way, during this war, of seeing letters from men at the front on both sides, and I assert that the charge is false and shows a pitiful ignorance of human nature. Miss Addams evidently knows nothing of the joy of combat; whatever faults the soldiers have, they are not cowards. The Germans, the French, the English, who are struggling from Alsace to the sea do not need any 'dope' to stimulate their courage, or to drown their fears. Some one has told Miss Addams this gruesome tale and she believed it.

"This is the same sort of thing that was said by ignorant persons of the German brigades in our civil war, and that my friend, Carl Schurz, resented with so much spirit. Would he were here to resent it now.

"Let me add that statements like this are characteristic of the Suffragists. I have been debating with them for two years, have met and heard their principal orators. They mean well, perhaps, but are always making positive statements which show ignorance of the fundamental facts of human nature. No fable is too gross for them to swallow if it reflects on the tyrant man."

SUFFRAGE FIRST; PEACE SECOND

IN an interview with Jane Addams, by Edward Marshall, in the New York *Times,* July 11, 1915, Miss Addams, the advocate of peace-at-any-price, is quoted as follows:

"The original idea of the conference was the formation of an international suffrage alliance in which all of the forty-two countries in which Parliaments have the right to give the franchise to women should be represented.

"The conference was to have met in Germany, but, of course, this was impossible. The women delegates from Holland were disappointed and suggested the substitution of a congress urging not the suffrage, but peace. Dr. Jacobs of Holland, therefore, really was the founder of the congress."

THE TRUTH ABOUT TAXATION AND SUFFRAGE

SUFFRAGISTS, in order to gain the sympathy of the woman taxpayer, declare that one of the fundamental principles of our government is violated because women are taxed though they have no vote. They compare this condition with that of the American colonists, who, revolting against the stamp tax, declared that "taxation without representation is tyranny."

This comparison is utterly false. The famous declaration of the colonists arose from the fact that the American Colonies were taxed by the Parliament of Great Britain without having any representative in Parliament familiar with conditions in the Colonies and competent to advise with reference to them. Under these circumstances a burdensome stamp tax was imposed upon the Colonists which was not imposed upon the inhabitants of Great Britain and this tax was not expended for the benefit of those who were thus taxed, but was withdrawn to England to be expended there. These conditions, which in no sense exist to-day, were declared by the Colonists to be tyrannical.

The Suffragists of to-day have stolen this famous slogan and would make you believe that taxation without *votes* is tyranny. This is totally untrue and totally different from the claims of the Colonists. The Colonists never said or believed that taxation and votes went together, nor do they. Thousands of taxpayers have no vote. Aliens who own property in this country are not exempt from taxation because they cannot vote. The residents of the District of Columbia are paying large taxes but they have no vote. A man may own property and pay taxes in a dozen states, he can only vote in one. Moreover, the man who digs in the street has one vote, and the man who pays taxes on millions of property, has but one vote.

Property is taxed for the support of government, for the maintenance of the public schools, for fire and police protection, for clean streets and good roads. If a woman is fortunate enough to own property thus taxed, she must pay the tax, if a child owns the property, he must pay the tax, if an alien or a voter owns the property, he must pay the tax. Whoever can afford to own the property pays the taxes thereon, and that tax is expended not for the benefit of an alien government, as in colonial times, but for the benefit of those who pay the tax, and for the protection of their property. But it is property and not the individual that is thus taxed.

Women, as individuals, are not taxed today in America, except those privileged few who pay an income tax. The only normal tax levied on individuals is the poll tax which only voters have to pay. All women in poll tax states would be taxed, however, if they became voters, whether they owned property or not.

Less than 10 per cent. of the women of this country are tax payers. Suffragists are not demanding the ballot for taxpaying women alone, they demand that nine women who do not pay taxes shall vote in order that the tenth woman who does pay taxes may vote. But the vote of that tenth woman will not decrease her taxes or help to direct how her taxes shall be spent for the other nine women who do not pay taxes will have a chance to vote against her. In every state where women have been given the ballot, taxes have increased. This is partly because of the increased cost of elections, but mainly because it is the rule that when you increase the number of non-tax-paying voters you increase the number of people who have no financial interest in keeping the taxes low. When you enfranchise women you increase the class of non-tax payers out of all proportion to the class of tax payers because compared with men, very few women pay taxes.

Therefore, the real tyranny is *not* taxation without representation. The real tyranny is raising the taxes and the cost of living without benefitting anybody.

"WOMEN HAVE THE POWER TO MOULD PUBLIC OPINION"

(From *Evening Sun*, July 23d)

TO THE EDITOR:

In saying that the underlying causes of the suffrage movement lie deeper than the average individual suspects, James R. Keene Taylor in his letter published July 9th has touched upon the most significant aspect of the question. I cannot agree with him that the Anti-Suffragists oppose the movement because they do not understand the underlying causes. When he refers to "the restlessness caused by the lack of some women for an occupation" he more nearly hits the mark.

The demand for political activity and expression is the logical outcome of woman's surprisingly rapid emanicipation from the restraint of the past. The broadening of her horizon with the corresponding freedom of thought and action has its result in the growing restlessness of the woman of to-day; it is a process of evolution, a vast amount of undirected energy which will in time result in the true woman movement, a movement which will not bear the hallmark of the suffrage doctrine because the suffrage doctrine holds the individual the unit of society, while the ultimate creed of womanhood can only be the greatest good for the greatest number.

It is quite true, as Mr. Taylor says, that vast numbers of women and young girls have been forced out into the world of industry by the change in our economic conditions during the past half century, but it is indisputably a fact, as given in the statistics of the United States Government, that 80 per cent. of the women of our country to-day are married women with families, which establishes the family as the unit of society, in spite of the fact that there are women who insist upon separate entities.

The ballot alone does not regulate the conditions under which men and women work. Else, why labor unions? Nor does the ballot raise wages. The law of supply and demand does that, and it is an established fact that the conditions under which women work and live are far better in many male suffrage States than in certain of the States where the ballot has afforded them an opportunity to demonstrate its power.

Admitting, as it does, that there are women as well as men who would be susceptible to political corruption, Mr. Taylor opens up one of the most dangerous aspects of the question both to womanhood and to the State. It is dangerous to womanhood because unless we can retain the unlimited power which our sheltered morality, in the sense of our immunity from political life, gives us to impart to the sons and daughters we are training for the State, we will lose our fundamental source of inspiration. It is dangerous to the State, in that the true efficiency of citizenship lies in the moral responsibility of the individual. The mothers of the nation are responsible for its morality. It is generally admitted that you cannot legislate morals. The only effective legislation is that backed by public opinion, and the women of this country today have the power and the opportunity to mould public opinion without denying to the men of the land the fitness and willingness to protect them politically.

GEORGIANNA S. BREESE,
President, New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

TRENTON, N. J., July 19th.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.
July 14, 1915.

EDITOR *Review:*

In reply to a letter in this morning's issue of your paper, entitled "A Plea For Equal Suffrage," by Viola Kaufman, I desire to submit a few facts.

Miss Kaufman says: "Before women voted in California there were two hundred dry towns, now there are 875 dry towns" but why did not Miss Kaufman say further that California in the last election not only defeated State-wide Prohibition by a majority of 150,000 but voted that the question should not be brought up for eight years? Six years prior to the adoption of Woman Suffrage in California, Los Angeles voted on Local Option, and the measure was defeated two to one; about a month after women had the ballot in Los Angeles, the question was again voted on, and the saloons won by nearly three to one.

Pasadena, California, had practically been a dry city, throughout its entire history, but soon after women were enfranchised, the sale of liquor was legalized. Pasadena had in 1910, 2,688 more women than men. At an election in California April 13, 1914, out of 13 cities and towns voting on the liquor question, 9 voted wet, and 4 small towns dry. Hanford, population 4,829, and Meced, population 3,102, both of which had been dry, were returned to the wet column. One small county, Lake County, is dry. The women of Colorado have been enfranchised since 1876. In 1912 a state-wide prohibition amendment was submitted and lost by 40,877. In 1914 it was again submitted and carried by 11,572, but in Denver, it was lost by 8,576. State-wide prohibition goes into force in Colorado January, 1916, but Denver assumes the right to do its own will in the matter.

Miss Kaufman says "Since women voted in Illinois, 110 saloons have been abolished. At Local Option in Illinois, April 27, 1914, twelve counties were added to the 30 already dry, making 42 dry counties of the 100 counties in Illinois. Kentucky, where men alone vote, has 105 dry counties out of the 120 in the State. Missouri has 65 no-license counties of 114 in the State.

Iowa has 77 out of 99 counties. Minnesota election, April 7, 1914, two-thirds of the counties where local options were held voted dry. Eight out of twelve counties voting in Michigan voted dry. Lansing, the Capital of Michigan, voted dry by men's votes, while Springfield, the Capital of Illinois (where there are 205 more women than men) over voting age, voted to retain the saloon.

I believe it has also been charged that liquor interests defeated woman suffrage in the States that rejected it on November 3, 1914, yet the only states that adopted it were Montana and Nevada, the two wettest States in the Union, with no dry territory, while North Dakota, a Prohibition State, South Dakota, 68 per cent dry; Nebraska, 56 per cent; Ohio, 52 per cent, all defeated woman suffrage.

I am, respectfully yours,

MRS. J. W. CRUMPACKER.
Representative National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE EVIDENCE FROM SUFFRAGE STATES

THE Massachusetts Association has issued the following warning to on-the-fence Suffragists:

"Massachusetts women, who are lightly told by the Suffragists that suffrage involves nothing more than five minutes spent in marking a ballot on the way to market, should bear in mind that, besides the time needed to become familiar with parties, issues and candidates, it carries with it, in this State, full responsibility for jury duty. Section 1, Chapter 176, of the revised laws of Massachusetts provides: 'A person qualified to vote for representatives to the General Court shall be liable to serve as a juror.'"

That this warning is timely is seen from the following item from the Washington *Post* of June 8, 1915, reprinted from the *Spokesman Review* of Spokane, Washington, a suffrage state:

"While the law is so stern that it refuses a mother permission to go to her baby while she is doing jury duty, there is nothing to prevent a baby going to its mother, at least that is how the law was interpreted in the court of Judge William Huneke when baby Margaret Hackett went to the court-house for her dinner.

"Father rushed Margaret, aged three months, in an automobile to the court-house. Mother gave baby her 6 o'clock meal, and father and infant retired, subject to hurry calls during the night.

"Mrs. R. W. Hackett was serving on a jury which failed to agree."

It has also been reported directly by letter that a two-months old baby has been left at a day nursery while its mother serves on a jury. Yet we find California Suffragists demanding jury duty as a "right."

(From St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*)

"PROMISING to contribute of her means to help pay his way through school, Mrs. Jennie Sachet, of Denver, married a medical student. Matches made under such circumstances are by no means unknown to the divorce courts. In the Denver case Mrs. Sachet continued to endow her student with her worldly goods until her means were exhausted. When everything she had was gone, dissensions arose. She sued for divorce on the ground of non-support, but the court gave Mr. Sachet the divorce, the wife's inability to fulfill completely the antenuptial pledge figuring in the decision.

"That a husband can, by a promise before marriage, obtain release from his obligation to support his wife and even impose on her a duty to support him seems, of course, a striking feature of the case. But a more striking feature is that such a decision is possible in a state like Colorado, where the women have been voting since 1893."

It is unnecessary to add, of course, that such a decision would be impossible in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania or New Jersey, where brutal man alone is the law-maker. Here the husband is bound, under penalty of imprisonment, to support his wife. Do Suffragists who are seeking the vote in these four states wish to carry their efforts to their logical (Colorado) conclusion?

On the county hospital proposition, at the Chicago election of June, about one in three of the men who voted on April 6 went to the polls and about one woman in thirty-three. Not registered voters, but actual voters compared in each instance.

On all propositions 9,372 women voted out of 282,291 registered and 189,700 men voted out of 486,815 registered.

Elihu Root's Position Re-affirmed

SUFFRAGISTS have recently resorted to an old political trick which is usually practiced at the eleventh hour, just preceding election. This method is to publish incorrect statements which it is too late for the opponents to refute. They have tried to make it appear that certain public men have altered their expressed opinions regarding woman suffrage. This was the case with the opinion against suffrage firmly and clearly expressed by former Senator Elihu Root of New York before the Constitutional Convention in 1894.

The attempt was not successful.

The following excerpts from an article in the New York *World* of July 27th follow previous articles in which Suffragists called attention to the fact that Mr. Root's statement was made twenty years ago and inferred that his present views were neutral if not positively favorable.

These excerpts from the *World* comprise certain letters from Mr. Root showing that twenty years of study and observation have made him more inexorably opposed to woman suffrage.

(From the New York *World*)

Three notes are quoted from him (Elihu Root) to show that his views have not changed, and hence that the contention of the Suffragists, who say his opinions of 1894 are out of date and have since turned, is not supported by facts.

One of the letters quoted was written in January, 1914, addressed to Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, President of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, in which he wrote:

"I have not changed my opposition to woman suffrage in the least; on the contrary, observation and reflection have strongly confirmed the adverse opinions which I expressed twenty years ago."

A second letter, addressed to a man in Omaha, written in the Senate in Washington, June 14, 1914, was cited in yesterday's statement. The following is quoted as from that letter:

"I have had so many things to do, I have steadfastly refused to be drawn into the woman suffrage controversy, so that I have many times declined to add anything to what I said twenty years ago in the New York Constitutional Convention on that subject. I have changed neither my heart nor my mind about it."

In order to bring the record of Mr. Root's sentiments down to this year, a letter is quoted, under date of May 3, 1915, addressed to Miss Chittenden, on the letter head of the present Constitutional Convention, of which Mr. Root is President, in which he wrote:

"Time has not in any sense changed, but has rather confirmed the opinions which I expressed in the Constitutional Convention of 1894, regarding woman suffrage, and you are at liberty to use anything which I said then as being an expression of the opinion which I entertain now."

Suffragists at Prize Fight Rebuked

THE latest publicity venture of the Suffragists shows strains of militancy and other tendencies which are made the subject of condemnatory editorials even in the columns of friendly newspapers.

Even the New York *Evening Journal*, noted advocate of woman suffrage, declared in its leading editorial:

"Those responsible for this particular folly should be eliminated from the councils of the woman suffrage party."

The "folly" was an attempt by a Suffragist to speak on suffrage from the "ring" between bouts at a "prize fight." The crowd was not at all inclined to listen respectfully to such an appeal under such circumstances.

That the Suffragists who planned the scheme and endorsed it by their presence were not inconspicuous Suffragists but party leaders is indicated by this list of some of the Suffragists present:

Mrs. Frances H. Brewer, the speaker; Mrs. Norman DeR. Whitehouse, Mrs. J. Wells Wentworth, Miss Ethel Plummer, Alice Morgan Wright, sculptor, who has been a militant in England; Miss Leila Wittler, a singer for the cause; Miss Ida Proper, Mrs. Jerome Myer, Mrs. Henry Russell, Miss Jeanette S. Grove, Mrs. T. T. Cotnam, Miss Mary White, Miss Estelle M. Burrows, Miss Rose Young.

The following editorial from the *Sun* of July 23d shows the general public opinion:

"Those women who have seriously at heart the success of the campaign for equal privileges at the polls are sincerely to be commiserated in view of the injury done to their cause by indiscreet adherents whose misguided conduct brings the propaganda into contempt and ridicule. As to the propriety and expedience of allowing women to vote the minds of most men are now open; the frequent repetition of such incidents as the ludicrous appeal to the patrons of the prize ring will close them firmly.

"Neither dignity nor a competent understanding of the importance of the right to vote is displayed in such theatrical and ineffective tactics. They cast suspicion on the sincerity of those who practice them, and inspire doubt whether political power or the notoriety that may be won by advocating it is the real purpose behind their adoption. As in England the methods of Pankhurstism alienated definitely men whose sympathies might have been enlisted for the cause, so here the heedless and light-headed imitators of British viragoes do more damage to a cause not yet won than can be done by its most determined opponents."

"Not a Word About Suffrage"

(From San Francisco *Examiner*)

THE Congressional Union for Woman's Suffrage, which has a booth at the Panama-Pacific Exposition and which overlooks no opportunity to spread the suffrage message, entertains an uncomfortable suspicion that it was the victim of a joke yesterday.

The Union asked Bishop Edwin H. Hughes of the Methodist Church to speak at a ceremony arranged by the Suffragists to celebrate Bunker Hill Day, and at which the Union dedicated a miniature Bunker Hill monument.

The Bishop spoke. He delivered an address which fairly rang the welkin all around the Massachusetts building at the Exposition. He told of the shots which were heard around the world, and of the famous ride of Paul Revere. He recalled to memory the feats of the Minute Men and Ben Butler and of the glorious things done in the name of liberty.

Freedom was his theme. But never a word about suffrage was said; never a word about "votes for women;" not a syllable about the Congressional Union.

Naturally the Congressional Union was aggrieved and indignant. What did he suppose they had him there for, one asked as the address rolled from the Bishop's lips, without reference to the subject dearest to the suffragist heart.

Miss Gail Laughlin then arose, and with scorn in her voice and fire in her eye said: "No one has a right to be here, or to speak here, unless he stand on the principles of freedom and liberty for which the colonists fought at Bunker Hill. They fought for freedom of all the people, and not for half the people, or men alone."

Later in the day the Congressional Union learned that it had made a mistake in asking Bishop Hughes to speak at its celebration, for it learned that, like a certain warrior, he was never more than tepidly in favor of suffrage for women.

There have been women mayors in a few towns in this country. The latest one is in Warren, Ill., where, according to the U. S. Census, the population is 1,331 for the village; 1,723 for the township.

Her election was hailed with great acclaim. On June 26th the United Press sent out a dispatch giving her opinion of woman after a few months in the Mayor's chair. "Men are cleaner political fighters than women are; women are more jealous than men; women are hastier in their judgment than men; women are more revengeful than men; women are less forgiving than men; women are more vindictive than men." Shall we add this element to the electorate?

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN CAMPAIGN STATES

MASSACHUSETTS

THE Massachusetts Association has been unusually active in preparation for fairs throughout the State during the coming months. In addition to the number of meetings, new branches have been organized, and many signatures added to the already large membership. There are over 33,000 enrolled members at present on the Association membership list. The distribution of literature has also been an enormous amount of work but the results have been extremely gratifying. Fifty thousand pieces of literature have been put in circulation during the last month, and there are constant calls at the headquarters for material for debates from all over the State.

Without votes for women, Massachusetts has blazed the way for the nation in legislation affecting social welfare.

It has led in prison reform. Charlestown was the first prison to adopt the honor system.

It established the first board of charities.

Its probation system was the first and is the best.

Boston supplied the first trained alienist attached to a municipal court.

Massachusetts leads in providing for effective birth registration, which is the necessary first step in the reduction of infant mortality.

Its health statistics are praised for their scientific thoroughness.

It made the first systematic campaign against tuberculosis.

The Massachusetts pure food law antedated the Federal statute.

Massachusetts established the first probation system for husbands guilty of non-support of their families.

It was one of the first States, if not the very first, to pass a workmen's compensation law, and a law prohibiting nightwork for women in textile factories.

The latter law, our 54-hour law for women and children, our maternity law and our minimum wage law form a combination protecting the wage-earning woman to a degree unsurpassed in any State in the Union.

Massachusetts is a pioneer in legislation regarding schools and children and its child labor law serves as a model to others.

Massachusetts does not need the votes of women.

NEW YORK

WHILE not quite as many meetings were held in June and July as in May, nevertheless, the records show that during the month of June we succeeded in entering several counties where we had never had much hold before.

Two very successful meetings were arranged at Bronxville, Westchester County, one at the Hotel Gramaton was an afternoon affair followed by dancing. Miss Price and Miss Chittenden were the speakers. Young girls with white dresses wearing hats with pink roses distributed the literature and pink cards to be signed, and afterwards sold the anti-suffrage roses to those who wished the privilege of dancing.

As a result of that meeting a Bronxville Committee was formed with Mrs. Wm. P. H. Bacon as Chairman.

Two weeks later a rose party was held in Mrs. James F. Horan's beautiful gardens. This was made quite a late afternoon affair so that the men could go up from New York and listen to Miss Price and Miss Dorman.

A committee has also been formed at Tarrytown with Mrs. Howard Carroll as Honorary Chairman and Mrs. Homer Foot, Jr., Chairman.

Our Westchester organizer also arranged several other meetings and is now forming additional committees and has arranged for several hearings before political bodies during the month of July and August.

Miss Markeson spent time in some of the counties in the western and southern part of the state with the result that several new committees have been formed and many arrangements made for future hearings before men's organizations.

An especially interesting event will be a Firemen's Convention to be held at Corning from July 26th to 29th. There will be a street carnival in connection with this, and Miss Markeson has secured space for a booth where we may distribute literature and also arranged to have Miss Dorman speak there one evening.

Miss Dorman recently spent five days in Fulton County and spoke twelve times during that period.

Miss Price started on the Chautauqua Circuit the end of June, speaking at Perry, N. Y., on June 26th, and reports very large audiences. The *Redpath*, Chautauqua, arranged for a vote to be taken at the close of each meeting and distributed separate ballots to men and women. It is needless to say that the suffrage element in every county was strongly represented at these meetings and the women's vote was consequently in favor of suffrage in many places. Miss Price, however, won the men's vote in all but three places, usually by three to one. She has received several requests to return and speak at places later in the season.

Special anti-suffrage editions, or pages, of papers have been issued by several of our branch committees and the cartoon—"Population Votes Not Area"—was used in thirty-five up-state papers.

The chief work which we are planning for the coming months are the county fairs. Arrangements have been made for securing space for the distribution of literature at over thirty of these fairs at the present writing, and there are several others to be arranged for.

The arrangements for the State Fair at Syracuse are in the hands of Mrs. Jerome B. Moore, Chairman of that Auxiliary Committee, and we will send one of our speakers there in September.

An annex has just been opened on West 125th Street. There are crowds passing the door every hour of the day and although it has been open only two weeks, it has attracted great attention in that neighborhood. It is hoped we may be able to keep this open until election.

Poster advertisements have been placed in every station of the Long Island Railroad. The posters read:

Vote NO on
Woman Suffrage
November 2d.

STAND BY THE WOMEN
Woman's Right is the
Right of Freedom from
Political Duties.
Vote NO
on Woman Suffrage
November 2d

Only Ten Per Cent. of the Women of New York Want the Ballot.
Vote NO on
Woman Suffrage
November 2d.

MILITANT WORDS TO HIDE MILITANT DEEDS

A STRIKING example of what purifying influence Suffragists exert upon political campaigns is revealed in a recent incident at Erie, Pa.

The unbiased, if somewhat shocked observer notes an old political ruse in the methods of the Suffragists who issue denials which at the same time accuse their opponents. Such phrases as "absolutely false," "half truths" and "whole lies," contained in a suffrage statement, suggest the extent to which Suffragists have adopted militant language to cover militant deeds.

The Suffragists' statement is here reprinted from the Harrisburg *Star Independent:*

"The following statement was issued here to-day by Mrs. Frank M. Roessing, President of the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association:

"'Miss Clara E. Markeson, one of the organizers for the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, has made charges recently to the effect that the Suffragists of Pennsylvania have adopted militant methods. She is quoted as saying that while she was distributing anti literature at the labor union carnival in Erie a number of Suffragists surrounded her, grabbed the pamphlets from her hands and destroyed them. She also said that when she struggled to get away one woman tore the cuff from her coat sleeve.

"'The charges have been thoroughly investigated and a report has been made to the State Suffrage Association which brands them as absolutely false. This report is concurred in not only by the men on the committee in charge of the labor carnival, but also by the editor of the Erie *Dispatch,* who had the affair investigated on his own account. In justice to the Suffragists of the State Miss Markeson's charges must therefore be denied.

"'The charge is absolutely false. The Pennsylvania Suffragists have tolerated the half truths disseminated by the antis in their efforts to discredit suffrage, but they will not tolerate whole lies from either Miss Markeson or any other representative of the Anti-Suffragists, whether identified with the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage or the liquor interests.'"

After the printing of this suffrage statement the following sworn affidavit was made by two disinterested spectators:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA
COUNTY OF ERIE
S.S.:

Before me, a notary public in and for said county, personally appeared this day, Peter Hardner and Barbara Hardner, husband and wife, who being duly sworn according to law, depose and say:

We reside in Erie, Pa., at No. 309 West 26th Street.

On the night of May 27, 1915, we attended Labor Union Carnival held in the Mayer Block, 14th Street and State, Erie, Pa. This night was called "Politicians' Night" at the Carnival. While we were at the Carnival we noticed a woman, whom we afterward learned was Miss Markeson, distributing Anti-Suffrage literature among the people attending the Carnival. She was followed by several women wearing suffrage banners, and these women were interfering with Miss Markeson in her distribution of literature by snatching the papers and leaflets from the people to whom they had been distributed and also by taking the leaflets away from the tables after Miss Markeson had laid them there. These women also made faces at Miss Markeson behind her back and shook their fists at her and tried to interfere with her whenever she would talk or distribute any Anti-Suffrage literature to the people. We were not acquainted with Miss Markeson, having never seen her before, but our sympathies were aroused for her by the manner of treatment which she was receiving at the hands of the suffrage workers. Miss Markeson at this time left a group of suffrage workers who had gathered about her and came over and showed us how the suffrage workers had torn the cuff on her coat. While Miss Markeson was talking to some of the men a little later on a woman suffrage worker approached her and those to whom she was talking and we heard the suffrage worker say to them that this Anti-Suffrage worker had "easy talking because she was supported by the liquor people."

While Miss Markeson was talking to us at one time during the evening a young man came up and said he wished to speak to her. She excused herself to us, saying to us that the young man was a reporter for the Erie *Dispatch.* When the two walked away we saw a suffrage worker wearing a banner follow and stand right before them in an attempt to overhear their remarks. We left the Carnival at this time but from our observations while there we know that Miss Markeson acted in a ladylike manner and her treatment at the hands of the suffrage workers was such as to arouse our sympathies for her.

PETER HARDNER.
MRS. BARBARA HARDNER.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 9th day of July, A. D. 1915.

HENRY R. JEFFS,
Notary Public.

Commission expires March 25, 1917.

Added to this sworn statement of facts is the testimony of the policeman on duty at the time. His testimony reveals that having failed of themselves to vanquish their opponent the Suffragists sought to have her ejected as a disturber.

Policeman Wilson, when asked on the following morning what part he had taken in the "disturbance," said a woman had come to him and asked that Miss Markeson be put out of the hall, as she had no business there. The officer said he could not do that as she was merely distributing literature which he found "unobjectionable." He could take action only upon request of the committee in charge, he said, and, of course, no such request was made.

NOTHING NEW

IN an article in *Everybody's Magazine* for July by William Hard and V. D. Jordan, presumably favoring suffrage, appears much anti-suffrage doctrine. Among the significant paragraphs are the following:

"George Creel made a big stir, in *Everybody's,* about new legislation in California under woman suffrage. And it was worth making a stir about, too. There was a great mass of it. But we were struck, then as always, by the absolute unoriginality of it.

"For instance, there was widows' pensions. Grand thing. But why didn't some woman suffrage State think it up *first?* Colorado had been enjoying suffrage for many years. But what State thought up widows' pensions? Missouri, where women don't vote at all.

"And the red light injunction law. Another grand thing. But what State thought it up? Iowa, where women have only 'minor' suffrage and have no political control at all over the social evil. Iowa *men* did it.

"In other words, we don't see woman suffrage doing *anything* that men haven't done already."

NOTES AND COMMENT

A Southern correspondent writes:

"Suffragists seem to have an idea that voting is a sort of a sausage machine into which, instead of a pig, one puts a vote and out tumbles their exact desire in the way of rejuvenated fathers, husbands and sons."

FOUR KINDS OF WOMEN

(From the *Catskill Recorder*, July 23d)

She who wishes the vote, and knows why she wishes it, is a Feminist. Oppose her.

She who wishes the vote, and does not know why she wishes it, is a Suffragist. Instruct her.

She who does not wish the vote, and does not know why she does not wish it, is asleep. Awake her.

She who does not wish the vote, and knows why she does not wish it, is an Anti-Suffragist. Follow her.

In a letter to the editor of the Boston *Herald*, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell writes:

"It is useless for F. G. R. Gordon to try to bolster up the claim that respect for women's lives is in inverse ratio to the prevalence of woman suffrage. There is in Germany a large party which favors equal suffrage, as he says; but that party has never had control of the imperial government. *The blowing up of the Lusitania was ordered and directed by Anti-Suffragists.*"

What does she mean? Does she know? Perhaps this is an argument for woman suffrage.

The Suffragists say that it takes too long to get legislation passed by present methods and so they need the vote. If it took as long to get a Mother's Pension Bill or a Child Labor Bill passed as it does to get through a suffrage bill we shouldn't blame them. We cannot, however, discover the cases where legislation of real benefit to women has been proposed and rejected for want of women's votes. On the contrary, women's interests frequently take precedence because they meet with no opposition and as a matter of courtesy. Political equality will change all that, the stock suffrage argument being that chivalry towards women having diminished, it ought to be killed outright.

Why does the average Suffragist consider it necessary to falsify the laws of her own State, to hold them up to scorn, in order to plead for the vote? The "antis" have pointed out law comparisons for years, have shown conclusively that the male suffrage States not only have more protective legislation for women and children than the suffrage States, but that in every one of the laws common to both suffrage and male suffrage States, the male suffrage State was ahead in getting it. Why, for instance, with twenty-four States having workmen's compensation—which applies to women too—are the four oldest suffrage States conspicuously absent from the list? How comes it that Pennsylvania, of the twenty-one States that have it, "has the best Mothers' Pension act in the country," according to the National Congress of Mothers? How is it that Wyoming, with women voting for forty-five years, has neither mothers' pensions, workmen's compensation or any limitation whatsoever of the hours of labor for working women?

THE Boston *Record*, which favors woman suffrage, endorsed the anti-suffrage idea completely when it said in an editorial under date of June 2, 1915:

"The Anti-Suffragists continue to manifest their activity. * * * Those opposed to the amendment will not allow the verdict to go by default. Every man and every woman in the State should familiarize himself between now and fall with the facts and the arguments; and no voter should come to his conclusion without a careful study of both sides. Is your mind made up as to how you will vote on this question? If so, how did you make it up? There is a wealth of material available, pro and con. Get it, from the opposing organizations. Attend meetings. Read facts. Study the issue. Vote intelligently. No more far-reaching question has appeared on the ballot for many years than this. It should be decided on a basis of full information and intelligent opinion, not on prejudice."

This is exactly the basis upon which the Anti-Suffragists wish the issue decided. Many a "prejudiced" Suffragist has formed an "intelligent opinion" opposed to suffrage through obtaining this "full information."

(From the Washington *Post*, July 23d)

A promise to vote for the woman suffrage amendment was the reward exacted by Miss Grace Hank, of Troy, from Albert Vause after she had saved him from drowning. Vause, who was swimming in the Mohawk River above Troy, was struggling helplessly when Miss Hank, who was sailing a boat ran the craft alongside of Vause, and with the assistance of a woman companion dragged him into the boat.

"How can I thank you?" murmured Vause as he regained his senses.

"By promising to vote for the suffrage amendment in the fall," replied Miss Hank, who is an ardent Suffragist. He promised.

Mrs. R. D. Johnston, of Alabama, is opposed to woman suffrage. She says she has never needed or wanted a good law passed in the States that there was not a good man standing right beside her to have it passed.

Mrs. Johnston's opinion is particularly interesting as she is active in civic and philanthropic work throughout the State and is the founder and president of the Boys' Industrial School of Alabama.

Suffragists have been saying lately that women are not allowed to practice law in Alabama, Georgia and Florida, or practice medicine in Alabama and Louisiana. At least a part of this statement is absolutely incorrect. In regard to Florida we quote the following letter:

To the Editor of the New York *Times:*

In the *Times* of Wednesday, July 14th, a letter entitled "The Door of Medicine," and signed Ida Moody Palmer, was published, saying that women are denied the right to practice medicine, in the State of Florida, by law.

Please allow me to correct the statement, as I have been unable to find any statute in the Laws of Florida denying women the right to practice medicine. The Second Vice-President of the Florida State Medical Association is Dr. Mary Freeman, of Perrine, Fla., a very smart and capable woman. Other women physicians are practicing in the State—the allopathic, homeopathic, and osteopathic schools being represented, and the position of First Assistant to the State Health Officer has just been tendered to our Dr. Ellen Lowell Stevens, a graduate of Johns Hopkins University. No. discrimination, because of sex, is made by the various examining boards, and a license to practice medicine in the State is issued to any man or woman who can satisfactorily pass the examination. Women are also practicing law in this State, so that we know this far Southern State is not as far behind in the progressive woman's movement as it is some times represented to be.

LOUIS C. MEIGS, Jacksonville, Fla., July 19, 1915.

Women have not been allowed to practice law in Georgia but there is now a bill before the State Legislature to allow them to do so.

In Alabama all discriminations in the laws of that State on account of sex are in favor of women, unless the fact that they may not vote or hold all offices be considered a discrimination. There are certain offices women may hold, such as registrar in chancery and notary public.

They may receive licenses to practice law and medicine on the same terms as such licenses are granted to men. In Birmingham Judge Kelly has for his law partner his daughter, who is a member of the State Bar Association.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Woman Suffrage *Carl Schurz*
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xanthippe on Woman Suffrage *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

NEW YORK STATE MEN'S ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO POLITICAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

27 William Street Room 1823 New York City

Brief before Rules Committee, Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionaire
Women and The Vote *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William I. Sedgwick*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift ($1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.

687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcraft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association, KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1915

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....